1 | it.

I mean, you know you're pointing to decision making as being the pivotal point. Well decisions, you know are never made in a vacuum. We all know that. But I'm in a vacuum right now, and it is my vacuum that I have to fill.

So, I'm simply saying that it's too early for me to tell.

MR. PHILLIPS: I understand.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You give me a heads up on it. Maybe we can take those documents in a block at some point and make a ruling on the record on it. And maybe you can't do that, maybe it's got to be document-by-document.

MR. PHILLIPS: I understand, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And I'll tell you another thing, too. I'm a very curious person. And my curiosity really gets peaked if somebody's trying to keep information out

you can even do it by email and tell me what

22

the documents are. Give me a number on the documents. And if I have nothing to do on the weekend, maybe I can look.

No, I'm not trying to be a wise guy on this. No, I'm serious. I'll flip through them and see, and try to pick up what the flavor of this stuff is.

MR. PHILLIPS: We'll be happy to do that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: One other issue concerns a witness that came up sort of at the last moment in the pretrial proceeding. A Mr. Rigdon, who is a recent hire by Comcast was added to their witness list at the end of February, February 22nd, without a witness statement of any sort.

As Your Honor may recall, the depositions in this case were scheduled, ordered to end on March 11th, and in fact did end the week after that.

Mr. Rigdon was deposed, but we

exactly. We knew that he was a new witness and a new employee of Comcast. We inquired on March 9th, two days before his deposition. We were told that he would be testifying not only about his new job, which was the person in charge of distribution decisions at Comcast, but also about his prior job where he had been a person in charge of distribution decisions at a different cable company, Charter, and that he would testify to that.

Now this was two days before his deposition and two days before the scheduled end of depositions. As it turned out, we had a couple of depositions following that.

Our objection to him is not really that he shouldn't be allowed to testify. It's fine. We have no problem with his testimony on his time at Comcast and anything he wants to say from that because we were able to get documents from Comcast. But with respect to his time at Charter, we really didn't have

Page 30

time and were not given the opportunity to serve a subpoena or to seek documents regarding Charter's decisions. And he wants to testify about what he did and the decisions he made while at Charter.

And so we would like to exclude that portion of his testimony which really has to do with the decisions he made at Charter.

Because again, Your Honor, we were not told until two days before his deposition and shortly before the end of discovery that he was going to testify regarding any of that.

So it's a little bit of a surprise to us that this has now come up and that this is going to be his testimony.

I think it's only fair that if we had known that he was going to go into his time and the decision that he has made while at a different cable company, we would have served a subpoena and gotten documents regarding those decisions.

Indeed, I might add, that even

during the deposition

And I'm happy to give Your Honor the cites in the record, if you'd like.

So, with respect to Mr. Rigdon, we don't object to his testimony coming in. We would ask the Court to strike those paragraphs of it that have to do with something other then his time at Comcast, instead having to do with his time at Charter.

JUDGE SIPPEL: So in paragraph 8 in the proposed testimony "Charter's decision to carry Tennis Channel on its sports tier was based on its and mine independent business judgment. It had nothing to do with Comcast's level of carriage." Is that the kind of thing you want out?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, Your Honor, it's exactly it. If you look that, and paragraph 1 also refers to all about his time

Page 32

at Charter and decisions he made at Charter and the broad carriage -- this is something we were not able to get documents on just because it was at the last moment.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you contact Charter at all?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, Your Honor, we didn't contact Charter at all. We would have subpoenaed them had this come up earlier in the process. We would have subpoenaed different documents. But as it was, as I said, we didn't learn until March 9th, two days before his deposition, after we inquired that he intended to give any testimony based on his experience at Charter.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And do you know if he personally has any documents to back these assertions up?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, Your Honor, I don't know. I assume that if he'd had any documents that were public documents that he could share, he would have produced them.

	Page 33
1	As I say,
2	
3	
4	
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Say that part
6	again; who has objected to this?
7	MR. PHILLIPS:
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
9	MR. PHILLIPS:
10	
11	
12	As Your Honor may know, Charter
13	went into
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I mean,
15	I'll ask Mr. Carroll, but what was your
16	understanding,
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I think it
18	was a Your
19	Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: But nobody's
21	contacted Charter?
22	MR. PHILLIPS:

Again, we weren't given enough time with two days to get a subpoena out for them.

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

JUDGE SIPPEL: That's a good

for us to explore those.

22 point.

1

Mr. Carroll?

2

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, I

3

actually disagree. I don't think that's an

4

accurate rendition of what happened.

5

First by way of background, Mr.

6

Rigdon replaced Mr. Bond in February of this

7

year and is now the person who is in charge of

8

content acquisition. He's the guy who makes

9

the decisions now at Comcast with respect to

10

what programs are carried on cable and at what

11

distribution level.

12

So in fairness because Your Honor

13

is being asked to issue orders now that might

14

have a go-forward impact and because we'd had

15

the personnel change, we identified Mr.

16

Rigdon within a week or two when that happened

17

and we served him up for a deposition, and I

18

did give him notice as to what he would have

19

to testify to in advance of the deposition.

20

And then I gave him extra discovery afterward

21

so that there would be no prejudice to them,

22

and responded to document requests they served

on us for any documents he had. And so that's the first thing about Rigdon, and that's the reason for the timing of it.

The deposition went forward.

There was no protest by them at the time that these matters shouldn't be in the case; we're not even going to take his deposition, we can't do it. There was no effort to come to Your Honor for any relief back then. There was no effort to do anything. And there was no complaint about the scope of my document production or anything.

On the eve of this trial we now find out for the first time that they want to preclude the testimony, and there's a reason I think that has more to do with the testimony then anything else, so let me get to that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, please do.

But you say "on the eve of," when did it come

up? What we're talking about now, when did it

come up

MR. CARROLL: I learned this

have an email that says, and in response to

22

Page 39

Now with all due respect, Your
Honor, I understand and certainly given more
time, we would have gone to Charter with a
subpoena. The document production in this
case ended in the end of January, Your Honor.
And we certainly didn't want to blow this
schedule for this.

My point is merely that they've added a witness. He has one month experience at Comcast, he can testify that experience at Comcast. But for him to testify -- and their main purpose here, Your Honor, is to try to slip in all the information he had about making decisions when he was at Charter when

we really haven't gotten any discovery on that issue. Comcast doesn't have it. And we have gotten the documents about those decisions.

And we weren't allowed to go forward with it.

1.5

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me clarify one thing first in my mind, anyway. This man is now an employee of Comcast, but hypothetically if he were not an employee of Comcast but he had this information, he had this information about when he worked for Charter, it was a another cable company, correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And that they had made certain decisions about what level to put the Tennis Channel on, which is that correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm just trying to set the stage here. His testimony would be sought if there was something that would be helpful to your arguments about how decisions are made to put people on different

1 levels, correct?

3

4

5

6

8

2 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And I'm sure that

Mr. Carroll would be objecting to it on the

7 same basis he's objecting right now, so --

MR. PHILLIPS: But in that

9 instance if we had known just like with any

10 witness, if we had known that they were going

11 to put on a witness from a different cable

12 company to talk about their experience with

the Tennis Channel, we would have subpoenaed

14 that cable company and gotten documents from

them regarding those decisions. So that the

16 | witness couldn't sort of testify carte blanche

17 as to the decisions. There would be a record

18 on paper of the decisions with which to cross-

19 examine.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I understand

21 what you're saying. I understand. I just

22 don't understand why -- I mean, there is a

1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right.

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. CARROLL: And Mr. Phillips has gone twice now.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.

MR. CARROLL: I'm still trying to respond to the first go around.

I've explained who Mr. Rigdon is and how he comes to be before Your Honor, and how he's central now to the content issue.

Now obviously, a key part of his background is the job he just held. And in the job he just held he was the guy, among other things, who was responsible for the negotiations with Tennis Channel over what carriage Tennis Channel would get at another cable company. Terribly relevant to this case because one of the key elements of discrimination as the FCC, and I think Your Honor, has recognized in other cases is what are the other cable companies doing.

Here's one of them, Charter.

Page 45

going to say among other things "Oh, ignore other cable companies who aren't carrying Tennis Channel because a lot of them just follow Comcast and they're really not making their own decisions." Here's the guy who is now our guy who was Charter's guy who can tell you firsthand as the witness in the box subject to their cross-examination "Here's what I did with Tennis Channel there, and that's why I come to Comcast I know about this issue already, and I have a very defined view about it."

Lastly, in terms of discovery,
just so Your Honor understands. The deadlines
were cooperatively extended to permit
additional discovery. Now I've not complained
about this, and I'm not complaining now except
to put a point back on Mr. Phillips.

They have continued to produce documents to me relating to their key witness who has been here for over a year as late as the week before last. I got a dump of 12,000

documents for one of their witnesses, Mr.

Solomon, who has been their witness for the
longest time. I didn't complain, I took the
documents, we moved forward. You know, it is
what it is.

They've had two months they could have been pursuing more documents of Charter if they needed to. They did pursue more documents from us after the deposition, we gave them all to them.

Even though it just happened, we gave them all the documents.

And last thing, they could have said at the time of the deposition "We protest. We're going to go to the Judge. He shouldn't come in." They could have said "Even though we have the documents from the Charter side ourselves, we think there's something unfair." They could have gone and called up Charter, as Your Honor suggested,

and sought the relief to get the documents, although again they have them. They were on the other side of the negotiations.

They didn't do any of that. And now to show up and say and say we would want to deprive Your Honor of this very relevant evidence that goes to discrimination and whether my client is discriminating or whether instead there's a market out there and we have a witness who can tell you firsthand, not an expert speculating but firsthand what that market was like, I think would be unfair and it would lead to an incomplete record.

So I think, in summary, you're gotten a very one-sided description of the exchange of evidence of discovery which is not fair. Both sides have continued to produce documents. They have had ample opportunity to pursue this issue. They don't like the substance of the testimony, and that's really the problem they have because it goes right to one of the core issues.

know Mr. Rigdon fairly well.

I mean, I guess they know, they should

21

22

1 MR. PHILLIPS: We didn't have the 2 internal documents from Charter, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, no, you wouldn't have those, but you'd have your own, the Tennis Channel's.

MR. PHILLIPS: We have that. We have the contract and the cost line that's there, yes, Your Honor. But what we didn't have, what we didn't have were the internal cost line that's the internal emails and like, which always are very revealing about why decisions are made.

Now it's not a fact in dispute
here about how Charter carries Tennis Channel.
That's not a fact. And that's a fact that
both witnesses take into account. We don't
think it's as relevant as they do. Our view
is what's relevant here is the different
treatment between Comcast on affiliated
channels and the Tennis Channel. But both
sides have -- there's been no disputed fact
about the carriage decisions made by other

MSOs, and other MVPDs which carry Tennis Channel much more broadly then Comcast.

All that being said, our complaint is very limited, which is that on March 9th, less then 48 hours before this deposition and two days before the stipulated end of discovery we're told obliquely that this other material is going to come in.

We actually didn't know, Your

Honor, how much of his testimony was going to

center on his Charter experience as opposed to

his Comcast experience until I got his witness

statement last Friday.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And then coming into the deposition you didn't get a feel for what was going on here?

MR. PHILLIPS: I didn't get a feel for that's the reason he was being offered.

I knew he had that experience. I frankly thought he was being offered to testify about decisions being made right now with respect to Comcast. He made a very grand statement in